DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 278 HE 009 552

AUTHOR Holmes, Karen A.; Otis, Jack
TITLE Is Tenure an Issue? Opinions of Deans of Schools of Social Work.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 28p.
AVAILABLE FROM School of Social Work, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712 ($0.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *College Deans; *College Faculty; Educational History; Graduate Study; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Social Work; *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Social Work Education

ABSTRACT

The tenure issue is examined by presenting a brief historical overview, the rationale for tenure systems, and some of the frequently cited criticisms. Subsequently the issue is explored specifically as it relates to social work education. The results are presented of a nationwide survey of schools of social work conducted to assess the attitudes of graduate deans toward existing tenure systems, and those findings discussed with particular emphasis on proposed alternatives to present tenure systems. (HSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148278

IS TENURE AN ISSUE? OPINIONS OF DEANS OF SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

Karen A. Holmes and Jack Otis
School of Social Work
University of Texas at Austin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen A. Holmes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE009552

Is Tenure an Issue? Opinions of Deans of Schools of Social Work

Among the myriad of crucial issues confronting higher education in America today, perhaps none stands out so clearly as that of academic tenure. Since its inception in 1915, the tenure concept has been widely discussed, frequently criticized, and often misunderstood.

The literature of social work education indicates very little with regard to positions held in relation to the tenure issue or its impact on professional schools. In the first part of this paper the authors examine the tenure issue by presenting a brief historical overview, the rationale for tenure systems, and some of the frequently cited criticisms of tenure. In the second part of the paper the authors attempt to explore the tenure issue specifically in relation to social work education. A nationwide survey of schools of social work was conducted to assess the attitudes of graduate deans with regard to existing tenure systems; findings from this survey are presented and discussed with particular emphasis on proposed alternatives to current tenure systems and their implications.

The Historical Roots

In order to trace the historical roots of the system now known as tenure, it is necessary to examine the influence of the German university on higher education in the United States. Initially, the fact that more than nine thousand Americans studied at German universities in the nineteenth century points to the significant impact that has been felt as the methods and ideals of the German university were transferred here.[1] Throughout the nineteenth century, German scholars proudly boasted of the "academic freedom" they enjoyed, referring to

the words Lernfreiheit and Lerhfreiheit; roughly translated, Lernfreiheit means freedom of learning, and Lerhfreiheit means freedom of teaching.[2] To the latter, Metzger has added "freedom of inquiry," viewed as an extension of the belief that knowledge was neither fixed, nor final.[3] As conceived by the German scholars and philosophers, these freedoms served as the cornerstone of the academic profession; without them, according to Freidrich Paulsen, "no institution has the right to call itself a 'university'."[4] The acceptance of the belief that academic freedom defined the true university may have been the most significant German contribution to American academic thought.

The Role of the AAUP

The American Association of University Professors came into existence in 1915 with the formulation of policy dealing with academic freedom. The very first application of AAUP policy occurred the same year, and interestingly, it dealt with cases involving tenure which was recognized as the primary support of academic freedom. The AAUP formed its standing Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure in 1915 and authored a "Declaration of Principles" which related to academic freedom; in so doing, the tremendous influence exerted by the Germans was acknowledged:[5]

> 'academic freedom' has traditionally had two applications - to the freedom of the teacher and to that of the student, to Lerhfreiheit and Lernfreiheit.

Philosophical and social thought in America during the early 1900's provides some clues as to why the issue of academic freedom garnered such extensive interest and concern, culminating in the emergence of the AAUP. The power of religious authority was shaken

by the Darwinian influence and the upcoming advocates of science. An empiricist bias became evident in academia, bolstered by scientific and technological advances; in some academic circles it was thought imperative to have acquired empirical knowledge before one could be thought competent to pass judgement on scientific questions. With issues of competing approaches to the truth, the facts would decide. The rise of pragmatic thought also played a part as univeristy professors became increasingly concerned with the "real world" and its problems, and they began to venture into the realm of social and political action. With this involvement there were demands for the same rights of free speech afforded to any other citizen; consequently, the issue of academic freedom became entangled with the concept of civil liberty, thus creating a measure of hostility and displeasure among some of the less tolerant and perhaps more conservative members of academia.

Tenure: The 1940 Statement and Subsequent Revisions

Although the AAUP published its "Declaration of Principles" in 1915, followed by a joint report with the American Council on Education in 1925 - "Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure"- it was not until 1940 that a set of working principles was published. It is in this statement that the relationship between academic freedom and tenure is most clearly explicated and that guidelines are presented for establishing a system of tenure. Both the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges (AAC) endorsed the Statement in 1941; by 1970, eighty-one organizations had endorsed it and most American colleges and universities had adopted - officially or unofficially - the proposed principles.[6]

As noted in the text of the Statement, the purpose was:[7]

> ... to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Tenure was viewed as a means to certain ends, specifically:[8]

> (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

The interdependence between academic freedom and tenure is clearly evidenced in the operationalization of the academic tenure principle. Section (a) on tenure in the Statement proposed:[9]

> After expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause*, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

Not content to simply outline the concept of tenure, the Committee attempted to present a model that would constitute "acceptable academic practice." Among the provisions were the following:[10] terms and conditions of appointment were to be stipulated in writing; the probationary period was not to exceed seven years, and one year's

---

*The 1940 statement did not define "adequate cause" although later references are made to "incompetence," "moral turpitude" and "unethical conduct," each with a variety of possible interpretations.

notice was to be given in the event of non-renewal; full academic freedom was to be afforded during the probationary period; academic due process was to be effected in cases of termination of a continuous appointment or termination for cause; and termination of a continuous appointment due to financial exigency was to be demonstrably bona fide. Recently the AAUP Committee A further refined and clarified these provisions in the "1976 Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure." By far the most specific document to date, these recommended regulations address each of the major issues clearly and in detail.

Tenure: The Rationale

The rationale for the adoption of a system of tenure relates directly to the protection of academic freedom, a concept which Fuchs has said rests on three foundations:[11]

(1) the philosophy of intellectual freedom;

(2) the idea of autonomy for communities of scholars...; and

(3) the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution...

If one accepts the concept of academic freedom based on these foundations, then one is likely to agree that there is a need to operationally provide a system that will protect academic freedom in practice - hence, academic tenure, and academic due process. This appears to have been the line of thinking among the faculty members who came from sixty different institutions to form the AAUP, and by their successors who have continued to refine and modify the earlier statements on academic freedom and tenure.

The Tenure Controversy

When the tenure system is presented as the mechanism by which academic freedom is protected one tends to wonder why there has never been unanimous support for it, yet some degree of opposition to tenure has existed since its inception. However, the various positions represent far more complexity than mere support or rejection of tenure as the protectorate system for academic freedom. Criticisms of tenure can generally be grouped into three categories: (1) discrepancies between the philosophical foundations of tenure versus the operationalization of tenure systems; (2) overall vagueness and ambiguity of tenure and related concepts; and (3) specific pragmatic concerns, including institutional financial commitment, decreasing job opportunities and the assessment of faculty performance.

The philosophical foundations of tenure, as in many other systems, may not in fact be clearly visible once the theory and policy have been translated into practice. For example, Rolf Sartorius refers to a dual standard of conduct that exists in tenure granting institutions; commenting specifically on the impact of the probationary period, he states:[12]

> For many individuals, the probationary period has been nothing less than a brutalizing, dehumanizing and discouraging experience. Especially in those universities that put a high premium on productive research, good young scholars have been forced to compete with their junior colleagues for the favoritism of the senior members of their departments with an eye to the inevitable tenure decision, a decision often made de facto at the time of the first or second renewal of an initial appointment.

A less pointed but equally relevant criticism has been the failure of tenure advocates to clearly define and operationalize tenure and its related components. Acknowledging this, Machlup presents a quote from the Supreme Court of South Dakota in reviewing a case in which a professor contested his dismissal from a state college:[13]

> The exact meaning and intent of this so-called tenure policy eludes us. Its vaporous objectives, purposes, and procedures are lost in a fog of nebulous verbiage.

In light of this, it is not surprising that many individuals - including faculty and administrators - do not thoroughly understand tenure in theory or in practice. Although the principles of tenure are closely related to academic freedom, they are not identical; according to Machlup, "the implementation of academic freedom should not be narrowed to the observance of set procedures or 'due process' principles..." .[14] The following comments from the 1973 report "Faculty Tenure" issued by the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education addresses the lack of uniformity with regard to tenure policies as well:[15]

> (there were) great variations in tenure policies and practices;... (including) definitions of tenure; its legal basis; criteria for appointment, reappointment and award of tenure; length of probationary period;... procedures for recommending appointment...; methods of evaluating teachers, scholarship and public service;...

It seems apparent that there is a need for both clarification and equalization of policies and procedures in order to make tenure systems more cohesive, and therefore more viable.

The last major area of criticism aimed at tenure systems is

perhaps the most often cited since it involves pragmatic concerns that reach both the academician and the institution. Costello notes that arguments against tenure focus on the following areas:[16]

(1) its cost to the institution:

(2) its effects on the present and future job market in academia; and

(3) the quality of faculty performance.

Of these, the cost to the institution is perhaps the least often discussed since it tends to be less visible to the faculty at large. As support for this argument, however, in 1973, W. Todd Furniss of the American Council on Education calculated that "a single grant of tenure represents a commitment by the institution of $1 million of its resources to the faculty member." [17] Over and above the impact of that figure in dollars and cents is the concern about declining enrollment figures which implies a frightening prospect for institutions already experiencing financial struggles.

The effects on the job market as cited by the critics of tenure are no less serious, particularly for young Ph.D.'s just entering the academic profession. Alan M. Carter from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education stated that nearly 50 percent of all full-time faculty members in American colleges and universities are tenured; looking at current trends, he projected that by 1990 as many as 72 percent might be tenured (other estimates are as high as 90 percent by 1990)[18]. Still others have expressed concern about the tendency of high prestige universities to become "tenured in" [19]; for example, Costello cites the following figures for 1972:[20]

> 84 percent of the full-time faculty members at California Institute of Technology had tenure; 75 percent did at Stanford, while at Johns Hopkins and Northwestern the figure was 69 percent, and at Yale 65 percent.

Figures such as these, plus the combination of lack of movement in terms of academic positions and the inflation-ridden economic situation affecting most colleges and universities, tend to paint a bleak picture for aspiring faculty.

However, another area, the quality of faculty performance, is probably the most vulnerable target for tenure critics. The concern is simply this: once a faculty member has been granted tenure, it is extremely difficult for a college or university to get rid of him/her. Much like a criminal judical procedure, the burden of proof lies with the institution - not the so-called "accused"; representatives of the institution must follow the guidelines of academic due process. Criticism in this regard is not aimed at academic process per se, but at the apparent fact that this protection is afforded to tenured faculty regardless of the current quality or quantity of their professional performance. In order to be granted tenure initially, one must meet certain performance expectations for a stipulated length of time; the critics maintain that once tenure has been granted, some faculty members abuse its inherent protection by failing to maintain high standards of professional achievement.

Unionization and Collective Bargaining - A New Direction?

In the midst of the controversy it is clear that both critics and advocates tend to agree that tenure systems should be more definitive and more specific procedures should be implemented. In

the meantime, while the latter half of the sixties spawned student activism and efforts to politicize academic life, the issues of the seventies may be identified as faculty trade union organization and formal collective bargaining. Ladd and Lipsett note that although professorial unionism was hardly considered a decade ago, "faculty at approximately 350 campuses were represented by bargaining agents, and at over 150 of these campuses faculty were working under a bargaining contract," all by the end of 1974.[21] Further evidence of the increasing support for unionization and collective bargaining in academia is found among members of the AAUP which traditionally has held a firm stance in opposition. The position of the AAUP does appear to be changing; for example, at the AAUP annual meeting in 1972, the Association voted by an overwhelming margin "to pursue collective bargaining as an additional way of realizing (our) goals in higher education."[22]

An important question which is raised by the growth of unionization is whether or not widespread support for faculty unions and collective bargaining will, in fact, reduce the need for tenure. Or, in light of what appears to be steadily increasing discontent and sentiment against tenure, will this ultimately serve to enhance support for unions? Based on the trend as cited by Ladd and Lipsett, one could probably predict that the movement toward unionization will become stronger, and there are definite programmatic reasons for such support. Since periods of economic inflation limit opportunities for faculty movement, tenure decreases in importance while support for unions increases. Unions are concerned with issues such

as inflation and the implementation of across the board raises while one's status with regard to tenure has little positive impact in these areas. In reality, if faculty concerns center around the pragmatics of economics as opposed to maintaining the philosophy of academic freedom as protected by tenure, there can be little doubt as to the furure growth of profassorial unionization across the country.

Despite this apparent movement toward unionization however, most colleges and universities maintain a tenure system, and while the tenure issue continues as the subject of much debate, views from a social work perspective have yet to be explicated. Recognizing the importance of this issue and its implications, the authors conducted a nationwide survey of graduate schools of social work in an attempt to assess the attitudes of deans with regard to existing tenure systems and practices. The data, although limited, provide some indication of the posture of deans in relation to the question of tenure for social work educators.

The Survey

An eight item open-ended questionnaire was developed and mailed to 79 deans of graduate schools of social work in April, 1976. A total of 33 completed questionnaires was returned providing a 42% response rate; approximately one-third of the responses came from deans of schools located in the Northeast section of the country. The questions were as follows:

(1) Do you agree that the tenure system is essential to the protection of academic freedom? If not, why not?

(2) What in your opinion is the primary advantage of the tenure system for (a) the college/university? (b) the faculty member?

(3) What in your opinion is the primary disadvantage of the tenure system for (a) the college/university? (b) the faculty member?

(4) Do you think that the tenure issue is different for social work and the professional schools generally as compared with the academic disciplines? Please explain your response.

(5) Tenure is typically granted on the basis of (a) scholarly productivity and (b) teaching excellence. Does your school use criteria of equal or greater weight? If yes, what are these criteria?

(6) Practice and field instruction are essential components of both MSW and BSW programs. Do you think that faculty with field instruction responsibilities have special problems with regard to acquiring tenure? If yes, please explain.

(7) Would you recommend any changes or alternatives to the current tenure system? If yes, please identify these changes.

(8) Please add any comments you would like to make in relation to the issue of tenure.

The only other information requested was name/location of school, number of faculty, number of tenured faculty, and number of students (graduate and undergraduate). Of interest from among these data is the finding that the range of tenured faculty is from 12% to 91.9%; the mean proportion of tenured faculty in the respondent schools is 52%.

Findings

In addition to calling for open-ended responses, five of the above questions (numbers 1,4,5,6 and 7), at least in part, called

for simple yes or no answers. These yes-no responses are presented in Table 1 below to provide a summary of the most straightforward part of the data. The open-ended data will be discussed as responses to each question are considered separately.

Table 1

Distribution of Respeonses to

Selected Tenure Questions

Questions	Response Categories							
	Yes		No		*Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Is tenure essential to protect academic freedom?	19	57.6	11	33.3	3	9.0	33	99.9
4. Is tenure different for social work compared with academic disciplines?	8	24.2	19	57.6	6	18.1	33	99.9
5. Besides scholarly productivity and teaching excellence, does your school use other criteria for granting tenure?	20	60.6	9	27.3	4	12.0	33	99.9
6. Do field faculty have special problems acquiring tenure?	20	60.6	10	30.3	3	9.0	33	99.9
7. Would you recommend changes to current tenure systems?	17	51.5	15	45.4	1	3.0	33	99.9

*Other also includes no response and not applicable

While the majority or respondents (57.5%) agrees that the system is essential to the protection of academic freedom, one-third do not agree. By way of elaboration, several respondents from the latter

group noted that tenure is no longer necessary for the protection of academic freedom in light of recent court decisions related to civil rights and personal freedoms, and the growing acceptance of unionization; or as one dean succinctly stated, "it's the prevailing culture, not the presence of law that ensures academic freedom."

When asked to cite the primary advantage(s) and disadvantage(s) of tenure for the college/university, several response categories emerged and are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Primary Advantages and Disadvantages of Tenure for the College/University

	Response Categories				
Advantages	Frequency	%	Disadvantages	Frequency	%
Stability/retention of faculty	13	39.4	Reduction in productivity	12	36.4
Protection of academic freedom/faculty integrity	9	27.3	Stagnation/rigidty	11	33.3
Protection from political and/or external pressures	6	18.2	Retention of incompetent faculty	7	21.2
None	5	15.2	Cost-financial	7	21.2
Quality of faculty	4	12.1	None	2	6.1
All others	4	12.1	All others	8	24.2

*N = 33; some respondents cited more than one - categories are not mutually exclusive.

Although stability and retention of faculty were cited most frequently as advantages, protection of academic freedom and faculty integrity followed closely behind. For example, one dean described the advantage of tenure as "a symbol of the freedom of the university to seek and teach the truth, regardless of where it leads." The finding that five deans (15% of the respondents) see no advantages of tenure for the college/university is rather interesting and might lead to speculation that tenure is sometimes viewed as more trouble than it is worth. Two closely related responses ranked first and second as disadvantages: reduction in productivity (36%) and stagnation/rigidity of faculty (33%). Among the remaining responses to this question, only two deans see no disadvantages at all for the college/university.

Responses with regard to the advantage(s) and disadvantage(s) of tenure for the individual faculty member tended to cluster in a few major categories as indicated in Table 3.

Table 3

Primary Advantages and Disadvantages of Tenure for the Faculty Member

	Response Categories				
Advantages	Frequency	%	Disadvantages	Frequency	%
Economic/job security	19	57.6	Complacency	16	48.5
Protection of academic freedom	13	39.4	Stifles freedom of junior faculty	4	9.1
Protection from external forces	8	24.2	All others	6	18.2
All others	5	15.1	None	4	12.2
			No response	3	9.1

*N = 33; some respondents cited more than one - categories are not mutually exclusive.

It would seem that the perceived advantages for the faculty members tend to relate to security of one's position and protection of that position. Not surprisingly then, economic (i.e., job) security was cited by more than half the deans (58%), although protection of academic freedom was also a frequent response (39%). Closely related to the latter is protection against dismissal from outside influences which was cited by nearly one-fourth of the respondents. In terms of disadvantages, the respondents were essentially in agreement that faculty complacency is a problem in that the acquisition of tenure eliminates incentives to improve, reduces the "competitive edge," and generally creates a static situation. This finding would seem to lend support to the position of tenure critics who have long claimed that some tenured faculty take advantage of their positions by failing to live up to a high level of professional achievement.

The next question to which deans were asked to respond is more specific to social work; that is, is the tenure issue different for social work and professional schools as compared with the academic disciplines? The majority of the respondents (57.6%) do <u>not</u> see the issue as different, while nearly one-fourth do see a difference. In explaining a yes response, one dean commented that "on several campuses ...the academicians still downgrade social work (not law - medicine). Since we are a small minority, our legitimate interests can be ignored in reference to criteria for tenure."

In response to the question specifically related to the criteria for granting tenure, nearly 61% of the respondents answered affirmatively that criteria other than (or in addition to) scholarly productivity and teaching excellence are utilized in their schools with

regard to tenure decisions. The criteria listed by the deans who responded yes are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Additional Criteria Utilized in Tenure Decision-making (N=20)

	Response Categories	
Criteria	Frequency	Percentage
University/Community Service	18	90.0
Professional leadership	5	25.0
Program/curriculum development	2	10.0
Grants/funding activities	1	5.0
Advanced degree	1	5.0
*Total	27	

*Some respondents provided more than one answer - categories are not mutually exclusive.

Service to the university and the community is clearly the most frequently used criterion (i.e., given equal or greater weight than scholarly productivity and teaching excellence) in deciding tenure questions; leadership in the profession, which ranks second, is obviously utilized to a far lesser extent. Among the responses that were categorized as "other" (recorded in Table 1, question 5), one dean stated that "research is singled out" as the most important criterion for tenure, while another dean pragmatically questioned the term "typically" as used in this question: "I believe your

typicality is a falsehood. It (tenure) is more typically given because of passage of time and with faculty political constituency."

One of the more frequently discussed issues related to tenure for social work educators involves those faculty with field instruction responsibilities. The majority (nearly 61%) of the respondents agrees that these faculty have special problems with regard to acquiring tenure. The reasons cited for this difficulty are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5

Problems of Field Faculty
in Acquiring Tenure (N=20)

	Response Categories	
Problems	Frequency	Percentage
Lack of publications, scholarly activities and research	10	50.0
Not eligible - due to rank, degree, non-tenure track	8	40.0
Assignments/activities not weighted equally with scholarship or classroom teaching	5	25.0
Inherent problems in evaluating field teaching	2	10.0
Other	2	10.0
*Total	27	

*some respondents provided more than one answer - categories are not mutually exclusive.

These findings seem to suggest that existing criteria utilized in many colleges and universities in making tenure decisions tend to contribute to a double standard between levels of faculty. It appears that faculty with field instruction responsibilities have comparatively little chance of being tenured because they are ineligible according to existing tenure criteria. This situation has profound implications not only for faculty currently holding field instruction positions, but also for the future of the field instruction component in social work education. The movement from field observation - to field experience - to field instruction in undergraduate social work education was intended to strengthen the preparation of students seeking a professional degree, yet existing tenure criteria provide the least security for those who teach in this area. Ultimately one has to wonder what this means in terms of administrative commitment to this seemingly crucial component of social work education on both the MSW and BSW levels.

The deans were also asked whether or not they would recommend any changes or alternatives to the current tenure system; as noted in Table 1, approximately 51% responded that they would, while 45% stated they would not. From among those who responded affirmatively, the most frequent change or alternative cited was implementation of a system of time-limited renewable contracts (59%). These recommended changes/alternatives are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Recommended Changes/Alternatives

to Current Tenure Systems (N=17)

Response Categories		
Changes/Alternatives	Frequency	Percentage
Time-limited, renewable contracts	10	58.8
Re-define current tenure criteria	3	17.6
Consider abolishing tenure	1	5.9
Convert to strict personnel management	1	5.9
Provide procedure for dismissal of incompetents	1	5.9
Do away with it	1	5.9
Total	17	100.0

Several respondents were quite specific in describing "desirable" contract systems such as the following:

> Long-term contracts, after an initial period of short contracts which would be viewed as probationary. For example, an initial contract of two years, followed by a second contract of three years, followed by a long-term contract of fifteen years, and then a reduction in contracted years to five years and then to three years.

The frequency with which the renewable contract alternative was cited seems to suggest that renewable contracts might represent an upcoming trend. One of the potential strengths is that this system might help to offset the tendency of some faculty to slip into professional complacency, a concern suggested by findings presented earlier. A related advantage might include the opportunity to

remove so-called incompetent faculty since the alleged security of indefinite tenure would not be available. However, renewable time-limited contracts would require careful scrutiny before being accepted as the panacea for existing tenure dilemmas. One dean warned:

> It is possible that other mechanisms besides tenure could be found to reach these goals (i.e. faculty stability and job security) - such as time-limited contracts - but I am not convinced that renewal of these would not require the same procedures as current tenure systems.

The last item provided an opportunity for respondents to add their own comments with regard to the tenure issue. Not surprisingly, a variety of responses was elicited, ranging from firm support, to frustration, to criticism in relation to tenure. For example:

> (Tenure) deserves attention. Deserves stalwart defense, public explanation, and understanding by the profession and newly entering members, who may be prone to let it go, understanding neither its significance, nor the efforts that went into winning it. A narrow sense of job security is <u>not</u> what it is all about.

Another dean commented that "with all its problems, and misuses, I still see no supportable alternative for providing some minimal protection for truly deviant and competent opinion on campus."

Implications and Speculations Suggested by the Findings

While the comparatively low overall response rate coupled with a relatively high response rate from deans of schools in the Northeast make generalizations from the data rather risky, some broad implications and questions can be raised.

Initially these findings seem to suggest that graduate deans tend to support the tenure system as a means of protecting academic freedom, yet this support is far from unanimous. In light of the

frequency with which the time-limited renewable contract was cited as an alternative to tenure, it may be that a trend is emerging. Support for the renewable contract may be in response to a need to counteract the tenured, "retention for life" criticism and the tendency of some faculty to slip into a pattern of professional complacency - concerns which are cited in the findings. The current financial straits of universities may also be an underlying problem.

Although the alternative of unionization was not specifically cited in these findings, unionization of faculty in higher education is an increasingly important fact of life. With tenure becoming as elusive as the Holy Grail in many institutions, will unionization gain momentum? If unionization rather than tenure becomes the norm, what will its impact be upon the ideal of collegial relations? Or has the multiversity already made the ideal an empty one?

The findings strongly suggest that since most respondents indicate that field faculty have special problems acquiring tenure (i.e. due to lack of publications, scholarly activities, research and/or ineligibility due to employment in a non-tenure track position), their status as second class citizens in academia will be reinforced with any continued increase in difficulty in acquiring tenure.

Finally, another finding of particular interest is that most respondents do not see the tenure issue as different for social work and the professions as compared with the academic disciplines. This is somewhat puzzling in light of the criticism of social institutions in the social work curriculum of many schools and the liberal policy positions of the profession. One would assume that faculty of

schools of social work, in contrast to engineering, for example, publicly take positions which are viewed as controversial and offensive to the power structure, thus accentuating the importance of tenure. One then wonders whether the failure of deans to underline the special significance of tenure is an indication that social work faculty and deans generally do not publicly take controversial stands with regard to current social problems.

Footnotes

1. Walter P. Metzger, Academic Freedom in the Age of the University (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 93.

2. Howard M. Jones, "The American Concept of Academic Freedom," in Academic Freedom and Tenure, ed. Louis Joughin (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 225.

3. Metzger, op. cit., p. 113.

4. Ibid.

5. Metzger, op. cit., p. 122.

6. Mary Costello, "Academic Freedom," in American Colleges: The Uncertain Future, ed. William P. Lineberry (New York: H.H. Wilson Co., 1975), p. 194.

7. Louis Joughin (ed.), Academic Freedom and Tenure (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 34.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., pp. 36-37

10. Ibid.

11. Ralph F. Fuchs, "Academic Freedom - Its Basic Philosophy, Function, and History," in Academic Freedom and Tenure, ed. Louis Joughin (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 243.

12. Rolf Sartorius, "Tenure and Academic Freedom," in The Concept of Academic Freedom, ed. Edmund L. Pincoffs (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975), pp. 140-141.

13. Fritz Machlup, "In Defense of Academic Tenure," AAUP Bulletin, 50 (Summer, 1964), p. 112.

14. Fritz Machlup, "Some Misconceptions Concerning Academic Freedom," in Academic Freedom and Tenure, ed. Louis Joughin.

15. Costello, op. cit., p. 194.

16. Ibid., p. 193.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., p. 194.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., p. 196.

21. Everett Carl Ladd Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset, The Divided Academy (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1975), p. 243.

22. Ibid., p. 247.

Bibliography

Brown, J. Douglas. The Liberal University: An Institutional Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

Byse, Clark, and Joughin, Louis. "Tenure in American Higher Education," in Academic Freedom and Tenure, ed. Louis Joughin. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, 210-223.

Costello, Mary. "Academic Freedom," in American Colleges: The Uncertain Future, ed. William Lineberry. New York: H.H. Wilson Co., 1975, 192-199.

Fuchs, Ralph F. "Academic Freedom - Its Basic Philosophy, Function and History," in Academic Freedom and Tenure, ed., Louis Joughin. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, 242-263.

Jones, Howard M. "The American Concept of Academic Freedom," in Academic Freedom and Tenure, ed. Louis Joughin. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, 224-241.

Joughin, Louis (ed.). Academic Freedom and Tenure. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Joughin, Louis. "Some Ruminations on Tenure," AAUP Bulletin, 52 (3), (Sept. 1966), 315-317.

Ladd, Everett Carl, Jr., and Lipset, Seymour Martin. The Divided Academy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Lineberry, William P. (ed.). American Colleges: The Uncertain Future. New York: H.H. Wilson Co., 1975.

Ludlum, Robert P. "Academic Freedom and Tenure," Antioch Review, X (Spring, 1950), 19-25.

Machlup, Fritz. "Some Misconceptions Concerning Academic Freedom," in Academic Freedom and Tenure, ed. Louis Joughin. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, 177-209.

Machlup, Fritz. "In Defense of Academic Tenure," AAUP Bulletin, 50 (Summer, 1964), 112-124.

Metzger, Walter P. Academic Freedom in the Age of the University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Pincoffs, Edmund L. (ed.). The Concept of Academic Freedom. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.

Van Alstyne, William. "Tenure: A Summary, Explanation and Defense," AAUP Bulletin, 57 (3) (Sept. 1971), 328-333.

Wolff, Robert Paul. The Ideal of the University. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.